Remarks:

Reconsideration of the above referenced application in view of the enclosed remarks is requested. Applicant thanks the Examiner for withdrawing the previous rejections. Claims 1, 3-11, 13-17, and 19-32 remain in the application.

ARGUMENT

§ 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 13, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 24-30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,009,524 to Olarig et al. (hereinafter, "Olarig et al.") in view of USPN 6,647,494 to Drews (hereinafter, "Drews"). This rejection is respectfully traversed and Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 13, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 24-30 and 32 and their progeny are believed allowable based on the following discussion.

Without conceding the propriety of combining these references, Applicant respectfully submits that Drews cannot be used as a reference to render the present invention unpatentable. More specifically, Applicant respectfully points out that Drews is co-owned by the assignee of the present application. As articulated in 35 U.S.C. 103(c):

> "Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more of subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the claimed invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person"

Since Drews does not qualify as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102 (a), (b), (c) or (d), it may only be deemed prior art under 35 U.S. C. §102 (e), (f) or (g). As a result, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(c), Applicant respectfully submits that Drews does not preclude patentability of the presently claimed invention since Drews and the presently claimed invention were, at the time the claimed invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. More specifically, Drews, which issued on Nov. 11, 2003 as U.S. Patent No.6,647,494, is assigned to Intel Corporation, the same entity to which the current application is assigned (assignment recorded on Oct. 1, 2001). As such, Applicant respectfully

submits that Drews is an improper reference for use against the presently claimed invention and Applicant requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection to Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 13, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 24-30 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claims 4, 14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Olarig et al. and Drews system as applied to Claims 3, 13 and 19 and further in view of USPN 5,230,052 to Dayan et al. (hereinafter, "Dayan et al."). This rejection is respectfully traversed based on the foregoing and following discussion.

As discussed above, Drews does not qualify as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102 (a), (b), (c) or (d); it may only be deemed prior art under 35 U.S. C. §102 (e), (f) or (g). As a result, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(c), Applicant respectfully submits that Drews does not preclude patentability of the presently claimed invention since Drews and the presently claimed invention were, at the time the claimed invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. Therefore, the rejection to Claims 4, 14 and 20 must be withdrawn.

Claims 7, 15 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Olarig et al. and Drews system as applied to Claims 1, 8 and 17 and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 200210025312 to Obata (hereinafter, "Obata"). This rejection is respectfully traversed based on the foregoing and following discussion.

As discussed above, Drews does not qualify as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102 (a), (b), (c) or (d); it may only be deemed prior art under 35 U.S. C. §102 (e), (f) or (g). As a result, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(c), Applicant respectfully submits that Drews does not preclude patentability of the presently claimed invention since Drews and the presently claimed invention were, at the time the claimed invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. Therefore, the rejection to Claims 1, 8 and 17 must be withdrawn.

Claims 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Olarig et al. and Drews system as applied to Claim 8 and further in view of USPN 6,182,219 to Feldbau et al. (hereinafter, "Feldbau et al."). This rejection is respectfully traversed based on the foregoing and following discussion.

As discussed above, Drews does not qualify as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102 (a), (b), (c) or (d); it may only be deemed prior art under 35 U.S. C. §102 (e), (f) or (g). As a result, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(c), Applicant respectfully submits that Drews does not preclude patentability of the presently claimed invention since Drews and the presently claimed invention were, at the time the claimed invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. Therefore, the rejection to Claims 9 and 11 must be withdrawn.

Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Olarig et al. and Drews system as applied to Claim 27 and further in view of USPN 6,487,647 to Samson (hereinafter, "Samson"). This rejection is respectfully traversed based on the foregoing and following discussion.

Without conceding the propriety of combining these references, Applicants respectfully submit that Samson cannot be used as a reference to render the present invention unpatentable. More specifically, Applicants respectfully point out that Samson is co-owned by the assignee of the present application. As articulated in 35 U.S.C. 103(c):

> "Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more of subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the claimed invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person"

Since Samson does not qualify as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102 (a), (b), (c) or (d), it may only be deemed prior art under 35 U.S. C. §102 (e), (f) or (g). As a result, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(c), Applicant respectfully submits that Samson does not preclude patentability of the presently claimed invention since Samson and the presently claimed invention were, at the time the claimed invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. More specifically, Samson, which issued on Nov. 26, 2002 as U.S. Patent No. 6,487,647, is assigned to Intel Corporation, the same entity to which the current application is assigned (assignment recorded on Oct. 1, 2001). As such, Applicant respectfully submits that both Samson and Drews are improper references for use against the presently

claimed invention and Applicant requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection to Claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

All of the pending claims are believed allowable.